

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 CFR. § 1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-7, 10-19, 21-25, 27-37 and 39-51 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1-3, 5-6, 10-17, 19, 21-23, 25, 30-33, 37 and 42-45. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 8-9, 20, 26 and 38. New claims added herein are 49-51.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0005] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on August 29, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0006] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references, namely Schofield and Schofield et al. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0007] I understood the Examiner to agree during the interview that independent claim 1 would be patentable over the cited art if amended to recite the “multiple windows” and the features of the “configuring”.

[0008] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0009] If the Examiner’s reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can discuss this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0010] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0011] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-17, 19, 21-23, 25, 30-33, 37 and 42-45 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and to more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

[0012] Furthermore, Applicant adds new claims 49-51 herein, which are directed towards editing presentation rules. These new claims are fully supported by the Application and therefore do not constitute new matter. To assist the Examiner in appreciating the claimed subject matter of these newly added claims, Applicant provides the following illustrative excerpt from Applicant's Specification:

In an exemplary implementation of the video management system 300, the presentation rules 318 are configurable and may be extended by a user. Using a user input device 336, the user can input presentation modes to be associated with vehicle events. The user input device 336 may be a keyboard, keypad, touch screen, mouse, or other input device. Alternatively, the presentation rules 318 (or a copy of the presentation rules) can be edited on a remote computer and uploaded to the vehicle via a network connection, or synchronized later using a wired or wireless connection to the video management system 300. The form of the input may be text, graphical, menu driven, an option selection format, or otherwise. The user input device 332 communicates with a user input interface 338 in the video management system 300. (Specification, p. 15, ¶ 2)

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 101

[0013] Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Furthermore, in light of the amendments presented herein, and agreement reached during the Examiner interview, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comply with the patentability requirements of §101 and that the §101 rejections should be withdrawn. Applicant further asserts that these claims are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0014] If the Examiner maintains the rejection of these claims, then Applicant requests additional guidance as to what is necessary to overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0015] The Examiner rejects claims 1-48 under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0016] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0017] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references in combination:

- **Schofield:** *Schofield, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,222,447 (issued April 24, 2001).
- **Schofield:** *Schofield, et al.*, US Publication No. 2002/0003571 (published January 10, 2002).

Overview of the Application

[0018] The Application describes selecting a video source view from at least one of a plurality of vehicle-mounted video sources based on detection of a vehicle event. The video source view may be displayed according to a presentation mode. Presentation rules specify an association between a plurality of vehicle events and a video source view and/or a video presentation mode. The presentation rules are editable and configurable. (see Application, Abstract)

Cited References

[0019] The Examiner cites Schofield (hereafter Schofield) as the primary reference in the obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Schofield et. al. (hereafter Schofield et. al.) as the secondary reference in the obviousness-based rejections.

Schofield

[0020] Schofield describes a rearview vision system for a vehicle that includes an image capture device mounted at the rear of the vehicle and having a field of view directed rearwardly of the vehicle (see Schofield, Abstract).

Schofield et. al.

Schofield describes a vehicular video mirror system that includes an interior rearview mirror assembly and a video display assembly (see Schofield et. al., Abstract).

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0021] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Schofield and Schofield et. al.

[0022] The Examiner rejects claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield in view of Schofield et. al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Amended Independent Claim 1

[0023] Applicant submits that combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not render this claim obvious because it does not teach at least the following features and elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

A method for implementing a *user configurable* video management system on a vehicle, the method comprising:

- “*selecting multiple sets of multiple video source views* from a plurality of vehicle-mounted video sources, the multiple sets based on:”
 - “a default mode”
 - “detection of a plurality of vehicle events”
- “displaying the multiple video source views *of one of the multiple sets simultaneously*”
- “wherein the displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views of the one of the multiple sets, and ***multiple windows*** within the full view mode, each of the multiple windows containing another of the multiple video source views of the one of the multiple sets”
- “*configuring each of the multiple sets* of the multiple video source views *according to user-definable presentation modes*, the presentation modes comprising the *default mode* and other modes, the *other modes being based on the plurality of vehicle events*”

[0024] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 3) the following with regard to this claim:

Schofield discloses rearview vision system with indicia of backup travel comprising the same method comprising: selecting multiple video source views from a plurality of vehicle-mounted video sources (fig. 1, el. 14, 20 and fig. 3) based on detection of a vehicle event (col. 10, ln. 53-56: display only when vehicle is in reverse gear); displaying multiple video source views simultaneously (figs. 3, 6, 8 and 10) as specified in claims 1, 13, 25 and 37; wherein the displaying the multiple video source views according to a presentation mode (fig. 2, el. 20 and col. 3, ln. 51-67) as specified in claims 2, 14, 26 and 38; further comprising detecting the vehicle event (col. 3, ln. 51-

[0025] The Examiner further indicates (Action, p. 4) the following with regard to this claim:

(fig. 3 and 6) as specified in claims 12, 24, 36 and 48. It is noted the Schofield does not particularly disclose the displaying comprising a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views as specified in claims 1, 14, 25 and 37. Schofield et al teaches the displaying multiple video source views in a picture in a picture format (paragraph 0262). And, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Schofield by displaying multiple video source views in a picture in picture format as taught by Schofield et al. Doing so would help to allow multiple images to be viewed simultaneously by the driver and/or occupants of the vehicle.

[0026] The combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or suggest that the claimed "displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views ... and **multiple windows** within the full view

mode, each of the multiple windows containing another of the multiple video source views". Applicant agrees with the Examiner (Action, p.4) that Schofield does not particularly disclose the displaying comprising a full view mode of one of the video sources, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video sources. With regard to this feature, the Examiner relies on Schofield et. al. and cites Schofield et. al., ¶ [0262] which states:

[0262] Also, multiple images can optionally be displayed in the video screen of the current invention. Thus, for example, should the video screen be displaying an image relating to a GPS system, and should the driver want to view the image from an in-cabin camera that views a baby or child seat on a rear seat, the driver can select the baby/child monitoring image as a secondary image displayed on the mirror-located video screen. Such use of a picture-in-a-picture (or PIP) allows multiple images to be viewed by the driver and/or occupants of the vehicle.

[0027] As shown above, Schofield et. al. discusses displaying a secondary image using a PIP. Schofield et. al. further teaches the picture-in-picture form is as common on home televisions (Schofield et. al., ¶ [0312]). However, the Examiner has failed to show that Schofield et. al. compensates for the deficiency of the claimed "*multiple windows* within the full view mode", because the picture-in-picture form as is common on home televisions as described by Schofield et. al. consists of a *single* picture within the picture, not the claimed "*multiple windows* within the full view mode".

[0028] Additionally, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or suggest the claimed "*configuring each of the multiple sets* of the multiple video source views according to *user-definable presentation modes*, the

presentation modes comprising the default mode and other modes, the other modes being based on the plurality of vehicle events". Instead, Schofield teaches in Fig. 3 that:

[T]he rearview vision system has a dynamically adjusted value of distance Q, the spacing between boundaries 50 and 52 will dynamically adjust in sequence with the adjustment of distance Q. Thus, as overlap zones 32, 34 move further away from the vehicle; for example, in response to an increase in speed of the vehicle, boundary lines 50 and 52 will move closer together and vice versa. In this manner, composite image 42 is dynamic, having image portions of dynamically adaptive sizes (see Col. 6, l. 14-22).

[0029] Schofield does not teach or suggest the claimed "configuring ... video source views according to **user-definable presentation modes** ... based on the plurality of vehicle events" because the rearview vision system has a dynamically adjusted value of distance Q that Schofield does not suggest is **user-definable**. The claimed features of the "user-definable presentation modes" are missing from the Schofield reference.

[0030] Additionally, Schofield et. al. teaches one or more user actuatable buttons 4544 or the like, which may, for example, be used to activate screen 4531 and/or other functions within the vehicle (Schofield et. al., ¶ [0337]). With further regard to configuring, Schofield et. al. teaches the following (Schofield et. al., ¶ [0549]):

[0549] Furthermore, any one of the displays or video screens may be configured to display an information display selected from the group consisting of a rain sensor operation display, a telephone information display, a highway status information display, a blind

spot indicator display, a hazard warning display, a vehicle status display, a page message display, a speedometer display, a tachometer display, an audio system display, a fuel gage display, a heater control display, an air conditioning system display, a status of inflation of tires display, an email message display, a compass display, an engine coolant temperature display, an oil pressure display, a cellular phone operation display, a global positioning display, a weather information display, a temperature display, a traffic information display, a telephone number display, a fuel status display, a battery condition display, a time display, a train approach warning display, and a toll booth transaction display. Furthermore, as noted, the video screens may display rearward field of view images, internal cabin monitoring images, and/or remote images, such as teleconferencing images, or the like.

[0031] As shown above, Schofield et. al. does not teach or suggest the claimed “configuring ... multiple sets of ... video source views according to **user-definable presentation modes** ... based on the plurality of vehicle events”. Instead, Schofield et. al. suggests using user controllable buttons to adjust displays. Pressing a button or turning a dial to modify a display is very different from the claimed “configuring ... multiple sets ... based on the plurality of vehicle events” because the user in Schofield et. al. is using a button to select a real time view, not to configure what will be displayed in response to vehicle events.

[0032] As shown above, based at least on the absence of the claimed feature of “configuring ... multiple sets”, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. do not teach or suggest this claimed feature.

[0033] Consequentially, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or render obvious all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claim 2

[0034] This claim ultimately depends upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0035] The combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or suggest that “user-definable presentation modes are pre-assigned by a user configuring presentation rules associated with each of the presentation modes” as recited in dependent claim 2 because as discussed above for claim 1, Schofield and Schofield et. al. teach and suggest dynamically adjusted display values, and displays configured by a user’s interaction with buttons. The combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or suggest that any “user-definable presentation modes are pre-assigned by a user configuring presentation rules”. These features are absent from the Schofield references alone or in any combination.

Amended Independent Claim 13

[0036] Applicant submits that combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not render this claim obvious because it does not teach at least the following features and elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “*selecting multiple sets of multiple video source views from a plurality of vehicle-mounted video sources, the multiple sets based on:*”
 - “a default mode”
 - “detection of a plurality of vehicle events”
- “*displaying the multiple video source views of one of the multiple sets simultaneously*”
- “*wherein the displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views of the one of the multiple sets, and multiple windows within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views of the one of the multiple sets*”
- “*configuring each of the multiple sets of the multiple video source views according to user-definable presentation modes, the presentation modes comprising the default mode and other modes, each of the other modes being associated with each of the plurality of vehicle events*”

[0037] For example, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or suggest the claimed “multiple windows” and the features of the claimed “configuring”.

[0038] In addition to other elements and features, claim 13 recites, at least, elements and features that are similar to those recited in claim 1. As described above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, without needlessly repeating the arguments above, the Applicant submits that claim 13 is

also allowable over the cited references at least for reasons similar to those given above with reference to claim 1.

[0039] Consequently, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or render obvious all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Amended Independent Claim 25

[0040] Applicant submits that combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not render this claim obvious because it does not teach at least the following features and elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “a display device for displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and *multiple windows within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views, wherein the display device displaying the multiple video source views is performed according to a presentation mode*”
- “a user interface to receive input **by a user** of the system for ***pre-configuring multiple presentation modes, the multiple presentation modes comprising:***
 - “a default mode”
 - “*other modes each based on each of a plurality of detected vehicle events*”

[0041] For example, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or suggest the claimed “multiple windows” and the features of the claimed “pre-configuring”.

[0042] In addition to other elements and features, claim 25 recites, at least, elements and features that are similar to those recited in claim 1. As described above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, without needlessly repeating the arguments above, the Applicant submits that claim 25 is also allowable over the cited references at least for reasons similar to those given above with reference to claim 1.

[0043] Consequentially, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or render obvious all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Amended Independent Claim 37

[0044] Applicant submits that combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not render this claim obvious because it does not teach at least the following features and elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “a display device communicating with the computer for displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and *multiple windows* within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views, wherein the display device communicating with the computer to *display the multiple video source views is performed according to a presentation mode*”
- “a user interface to receive input by a user of the vehicle for pre-configuring multiple presentation modes, the multiple presentation modes comprising:”
 - “a default mode for displaying when no vehicle event is detected”
 - “other modes each based on each of a plurality of detected vehicle events”

[0045] For example, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or suggest the claimed “multiple windows” and the features of the claimed “configuring”.

[0046] In addition to other elements and features, claim 37 recites, at least, elements and features that are similar to those recited in claim 1. As described above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, without needlessly repeating the arguments above, the Applicant submits that claim 37 is

also allowable over the cited references for reasons similar to those given above with reference to claim 1.

[0047] Consequently, the combination of Schofield and Schofield et. al. does not teach or render obvious all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims

[0048] If not already addressed individually above, in addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for at least the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0049] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/E. John Fain/ Dated: 9/25/08
E. John Fain (johnf@leehayes.com; x256)
Registration No. 60,960
John C. Meline (johnm@leehayes.com; x257)
Registration No. 58,280
Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com